

**Remarks/Arguments**

Reconsideration of the Application is requested. The Examiner has objected to the drawings because the hand written numbers are not clear.

Will the Examiner please approve the new drawings of Figs. 1-15 that replace the handwritten numbers with numbers generated by a computer printer.

Claim 4 has been rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC §112 for failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Paragraph 006 of the specification has been amended to comply with the enablement requirement.

Claims 1, 2 and 4 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Rhoads (U.S. Patent No. 6,636,615).

Rhoads discloses the following in lines 20-37 of column 4.

“The document **10** includes an image (not explicitly shown) that has two digital watermarks inserted therein. In the first embodiment of the invention, the first watermark has a fine grain and the second watermark has a course grain. The grain of the two watermarks is illustrated in FIG. 2 FIG 2A shows the grain of the first watermark and FIG. 2B shows the grain of the second watermark. The first watermark uses blocks of 9 pixels (a 3 by 3 block). Each of the pixels in each 9 pixel block has its gray value changed by the same amount. For example FIG. 2A shows that the first 9 pixel block has its gray value increase and the second 9 pixel block has its gray value decreased. The amount of increase and the selection of blocks that is increased and decreased is conventional.”

As shown in FIG. 2B, the grain of the second watermark is in blocks that are 6 pixels by 6 pixels or 36 pixels. All of the pixels in each 36 pixel block are changed by the same amount.”

Rhoads discloses the following in line 56 of column 4 to line 15 of column 5.

“FIGS. 3A and 3B show an alternative technique for implementing the present invention. In the second embodiment of the invention, the two watermarks inserted into the image on a document have different patterns

of assigning pixels to the bits of the payload represented by the watermark. The first watermark utilizes a geometrically linear assignment of pixels to each bit. For example FIG. 3A shows an image that has 500 by 500 pixels. Considering a watermark payload with 50 bits, each bit of the watermark would have 5000 pixels assigned to represent that bit. A linear assignment could have each fifth bit in each row (100 bits per row) and each fifth row (50 rows) assigned to each bit of the watermark. Thus 5000 pixels would be assigned to each bit in a very orderly or linear manner.

In the second watermark the pixels would be assigned to each bit in a random manner as shown in FIG. 3B. Each bit in the watermark would still have 5000 assigned bits; however, the pixels would be a random location over the image. Naturally it should be understood that FIG. 3A and 3B illustrate how pixels are assigned to one bit of the watermark. The other bits of the watermarks would have pixels assigned in a similar manner. Similar to the first embodiment of the invention, the watermark with a linear assignment of pixels and the watermark with a random assignment of pixels would be affected differently by handling and wear on the original document than they would be by being scanned and reprinted."

Rhoads modifies an image by embedding a watermark in an image. Rhoads is watermarking a continuous tone.

Applicant's claims in claim 1 as amended and those claims dependent thereon a different and non obvious invention than that disclosed by Rhoads. Rhoads does not disclose or anticipate the following steps of claim 1, namely representing the first binary array as a first set of modules of a first size of  $n \times n$  pixels wherein each pixel is either white or black and every pixel in the module is identical to every other pixel in the module on nodes of a first lattice; representing the second binary array as a second set of modules of a second size, of  $m \times m$  wherein each pixel is either white or black and every pixel in the module is identical to every other pixel in the module which is smaller than the first size on nodes of a second lattice; combining the first and second sets of modules; and

Applicant's watermark a binary monochromatic background to which Applicant's combine first and second sets of modules that are at the nodes of complimentary arrays i.e. the arrays are meshed together.

Furthermore, Rhoads discloses two arrays wherein the second array is a sub-array of the first array. There is no such relationship between Applicant's arrays.

Claim 3 has been rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC § 103(a) as being patentable over Rhoads (U.S. Patent No. 6,636,615) further in view of Rhoads (Pub. No. U.S. 2001/0022848A1).

In paragraph 0008 of Pub. No. U.S. 2001/022848A1 Rhoads discloses the following.

"The present invention relates to methods and systems for inconspicuously embedding binary data in security documents, and associated methods/systems for detecting/decoding such data. ("Security document" is used herein to refer to negotiable Financial instruments (e.g. banknotes, traveler's checks, and bearer bonds), passports, visas, other immigration documents, stock certificates, postal stamps, lottery tickets, sports/concert tickets, etc.) One application of this the invention is in discouraging counterfeiting of security documents. Another is in transferring machine-readable information through such documents, without alerting human viewers to the presence of such information."

Rhoads' Publication discloses a postage stamp not a postal indicia. Furthermore, both Rhoads references taken separately or together do not disclose or anticipate the following steps of claim 1, namely representing the first binary array as a first set of modules of a first size on nodes of a first lattice; representing the second binary array as a second set of modules of a of  $m \times m$  wherein each pixel is either white or black and every pixel in the module is identical to every other pixel in the module second size, which is smaller than the first size on nodes of a second lattice; combining the first and second sets of modules.

Claims 5-8 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muratani (U.S. Patent No. 6,768,807B1) in view of Roberts (U.S. Patent No. 6,882,442B2).

Muratani discloses the following in line 28-47 of Column 5.

"The first digital watermark embedding device by which digital data is assumed to be an embedding target and the digital watermark is embedded, according to the present invention is characterized by comprising: spread spectrum means to set said embedding target to be a unit spreading block which performs the spread spectrum of the spreading block in which said embedding target includes more than two adjacent

basic unit of each bases which constructs the plurality of basic units, multiplies the same pseudo-random number signal is multiplied to said embedding target more than two said basic units in said unit spreading block, and watermark embedding means to embed the digital watermark information embedded by the direct sequence spread spectrum method can be prevented being distributed to the high frequency region in the inverse spread spectrum processing, in addition, digital watermark information can not be easily disappeared."

Muratani discloses the following in Column 20 lines 1-9.

"Embedded position selection section 81 decides the position in the frequency domain where watermark information should be embedded without depending on the frequency component value (embedded position). In the following explanation, it is assumed that the embedded position (u, v) is one point, and and it is also possible to set a plurality of points embedded positions. In that case, embedded position selection section 81 gives set Sf of embedded position (u, v) in the frequency domain."

Muratani discloses the following in column 20 lines 29-48.

"In addition, to avoid the beating between watermark information embedded in two or more positions, the embedded position may be decided in embedded position selection section 81. For example, when the plurality of embedded positions generated with random numbers has a turning value with the same point and the neighborhood point in the pixel value domain, it might be able to be recognized when overlap of a turning value becomes an area having one dimension or two-dimensional extensions but not at one point. Then, the function to judge whether such a beating is occurred between plurality of embedded positions to embedded position selection section 81 is provided, the validity of the candidate is judged by this judgment function every time the candidate in the embedded position is generated, a corresponding candidate is abandoned when judged an improper candidate, and the configuration which selects it as an

element of set Sf of the embedded position may be added when judged an appropriate candidate.”

Roberts discloses the following in lines 6-30 of column 19.

“Where a plurality of remote users access and print coupons from a variety of remote station configurations having a variety of printer types, the particular resolution associated with each such printer type may vary widely. Inaccuracies arise when the pixel width of a barcode image does not match or align with the available pixels in a defined width based on a given printer’s resolution.

A very basic example of this is illustrated in the series of FIGS. 11A-11D, wherein a barcode 200 has a pixel width PW of two and the bar code comprises one black stripe 202 adjacent one white stripe 204. For a given printer having a resolution of 3, the prior art methods would stretch the image by a factor of 1.5 and every third pixel column would be interpolated to generate print information. This misalignment factor of 3 is arrived at by taking the print area width, 3, and dividing by the difference  $(3-2=1)$  between the print area, 3, and the bar code pixel width, 2. The prior art rendering methods would result in a printed image having one of the following bar sequences: 1) black, gray, white, FIG. 11B; 2) black, black, white, FIG. 11C; or 3) black, white, white, FIG. 11D. In all three of these resulting stripe sequences the printed image is an inaccurate representation of the original bar code data and the bar code reader will detect the inaccuracies and the decoder will compile inaccurate data therefrom.”

Neither Muratani or Roberts taken separately or together disclose or anticipate the following step of claim 5 as amended, namely applying a spreading algorithm to the first part and second part to further hide the information in the first and second parts.

The cited references transform the image in a different manner than that claimed by applicants.

Claims 9-17 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Muratani (U.S. Patent No. 6,768,807B1), Roberts (U.S. Patent No. 6,882,442B2)


and Rhoads (Pub. No. U.S. 2001/0022848A1) and further in view of Rhoads (U.S. Patent No. 6,636,615).

The cited references do not disclose or anticipate the following step of claim 5 namely applying a spreading algorithm to the first part and second part to scramble the information further hide the information in the first and second parts in a manner that the spreading algorithm will move pixels in the first image and the second image so that the moved pixels will not be close together.

Appln. No.: 10/087,518  
Amdt. Dated August 22, 2005  
Reply to Office Action dated May 26, 2005

In view of the above claims 1-17 as amended are patentable. If the Examiner has any questions would the Examiner please call the undersigned at the telephone number noted below.

Respectfully submitted,



Ronald Reichman  
Reg. No. 26,796  
Attorney of Record  
Telephone (203) 924-3854

PITNEY BOWES INC.  
Intellectual Property and  
Technology Law Department  
35 Waterview Drive  
P.O. Box 3000  
Shelton, CT 06484-8000